

THE FORT SNELLING SWINDLE.

The sale by the present Secretary of War of Fort Snelling, including the reservation of eight or ten thousand acres of valuable land lying between the rivers Mississippi and Minnesota at their junction, six miles above the city of St. Paul and about the same distance below the Falls of St. Anthony, has very naturally excited general comment and aroused much indignation. An investigation of the origin and character of this sale was ordered by the House early in January, and a fair Committee (two Administration men, two Republicans, one Douglas Democrat) appointed by Speaker Orr to make it. That Committee took testimony at intervals throughout the first three months of this year, and this testimony has been reported by them in a volume of 368 pages, pungent extracts from which are given on another page of this sheet. Those extracts—being the evidence of the Hon. Robert Smith of Illinois, who formally demanded the investigation, and of the Hon. Richard Schell of this city, who was one of the silent partners in the purchase—will serve to give a clear and careful reader a pretty clear idea of the nature of the transaction. Let us endeavor to present in order its most prominent features, viz.:

1. At the last session of Congress, at the very close of the session, an amendment was foisted into one of the General Appropriation bills authorizing the Secretary of War to sell such of the U. S. Military Reservations as were no longer required for military purposes. This amendment, though moved in the Senate by Mr. Weller of California, was prompted (as Mr. R. himself testifies) by Mr. Rice, then Delegate (now U. S. Senator elect) from Minnesota, with a special eye to the sale of the Fort Snelling reservation.

2. This amendment was received with distrust by Senators, who inquired:—"How are these lands to be sold?" Mr. Weller promptly and confidently answered, "At public sale." This quieted all opposition, and the amendment was adopted. Probably less than half the Senate, and hardly a Member of the House, were aware of its existence. Nothing was said of the matter in the newspapers; and, so far as can be ascertained, not twenty people in all were aware that the sale of this Reserve was contemplated, until the fact transpired, about mid-summer, that it had been privately sold by the Secretary through the agency of two Commissioners of his appointment, to Mr. Franklin Steele, who had long been Army sutler at that Fort, and claimed to own certain buildings there. There was no advertisement, no public announcement that this Reserve was for sale, until after it had been actually sold; and the three or four persons who suspected, or guessed, or had heard rumors, that it might be put in market, were unable to learn that any such sale was going forward. The Hon. Robert Smith testifies that he wrote the Secretary from Minnesota in April, stating that he desired to know if, when and how this Reserve was to be sold, desiring to bid for a part of it. This letter was never acknowledged in any way; when he again wrote (July 2,) he received an answer (dated 21st) informing him that the Reserve had been sold.

3. Mr. John B. Floyd of Virginia became Secretary of War on the 4th or 5th of March, 1857—directly after the passage of the Rice-amendment aforesaid. Though then a novice at Washington, he seems to have been early posted up with regard to this Rice-amendment and its bearing on the Fort Snelling reserve. Dr. Arch. Graham of Lexington, Va. (but who appears to be quite at home in Washington,) testifies that he called on Secretary Floyd (an old friend) in April, 1857, told Mr. F. he was going to Minnesota to make investments, and would like anything to do in that quarter that would pay his expenses. "He told me he had nothing, unless I took the agency of some old forts that Congress had directed the sale of." He mentioned Fort Snelling and Fort Ripley. [Congress had "directed" the sale of no forts, but only such as were no longer needed for military purposes might be sold.] Dr. Graham inwardly decided that he should prefer to go into this business as a purchaser, so he told Secretary Floyd he would think of the matter, and in due time wrote the Secretary a note declining the agency, and went to Minnesota to buy the Fort Snelling tract, not to sell it. There he figured as the agent or representative of the Hon. John C. Mather, Mr. Richard and Mrs. Richard Schell (which doesn't mean Mr. Augustus) of this city, and was secretly a partner with Mr. Franklin Steele in buying the property—the Commissioners now swearing that they didn't know him in that capacity, nor suppose anybody but Franklin Steele concerned in the purchase. Mr. Secretary Floyd also knew nobody as concerned in the purchase but Franklin Steele. We say Mr. Richard Schell doesn't mean Mr. Augustus Schell, because both the Mr. Schells so testify; but it appears that Mr. Augustus Schell lent Mr. Richard Schell \$5,000 of the money put into this operation, and has not yet got it back, though Mr. Richard Schell is attested by her husband to be worth \$100,000. And Dr. Arch. Graham, who was going up to Minnesota to speculate in lands before he ever heard of Fort Snelling or had any relations with Mather and the Schells, appears not to have put one dollar into this nor anything else. It doesn't look as though he had anything to put in. Franklin Steele has paid in \$10,000, Mather and the Schells \$20,000, but Dr. Graham just nothing at all except his services, for which he is to have \$5000 a year, and is "let in" for one-twenty-seventh of the purchase.

4. Mr. Secretary Floyd, coming green into the War Department on the 4th or 5th of March, was formally applied to by Delegate Rice on the 7th of April following. In his letter, Mr. Rice says: "Fort Snelling will probably be required as a depot, and with it say forty acres of the present reservation." Yet, green as Mr. Floyd was in Army matters, he never applied to Gen. Scott, Commander-in-Chief, nor to Gen. Persifer F. Smith, commanding in that military division, to ascertain whether this reserve could now be given up, and if not, how much of it. He did submit the matter to Quartermaster-General Jesup, but when does not appear, as his letter of application is not given, and Gen. Jesup's response appears without date. Gen. Jesup's answer, however, ought to have arrested the sale at once. He says:

"If the troops are to be kept as much as possible concentrated at central points, where they can be cheaply supplied when not in the field, then there is no place near the Northern frontier so suitable as Fort Snelling. If this policy is to be adopted, and it certainly is the true policy, not a foot of the site of

Fort Snelling can be spared, without weakening the defense of the frontier."

In the face of this opinion, and without consulting any other military authority, the six-weeks old Secretary pushed on the sale!

5. Some time in April, Maj. Seth Eastman of the Army, an old crony of Steele's, was sent out by Secretary Floyd to survey the Fort Snelling Reserve into forty-acre lots, with only verbal orders. On the 25th of May, Major Eastman and William King Heiskell, a neighbor in Virginia, and special political and personal ally of Secretary Floyd, were appointed by him Commissioners, at \$8 per day and expenses, to go out to Minnesota and sell the Fort Snelling Reserve. Dr. Arch. Graham was already on the ground, as was Maj. Eastman in his capacity of Surveyor. Franklin Steele was living there where he had lived for many years as sutler. To make the witch-broth "slab and good," Mr. John C. Mather was about this time appointed by Secretary Floyd a Commissioner to go out to Minnesota (at \$8 a day and expenses) and there examine and report on the Fort Ripley reservation. He did so, having arranged with the Schells and with Dr. Graham to dip into Fort Snelling if that should seem "right." So the 1st of June or thereabouts found the whole party, except Secretary Floyd and the Schells, at or about Fort Snelling.

6. The Commissioners, Eastman and Heiskell, were appointed at Washington on the 25th of May last; on the 6th of June—eleven days thereafter—they had executed at Fort Snelling the sale of the whole Reserve to Franklin Steele for \$90,000—one third to be paid on the 10th of July following; "the balance in two equal annual payments thereafter." "Possession to be given as soon as the Secretary of War can dispense with it for military purposes, and a deed given when the first payment aforesaid is made, and satisfactory security for the deferred payments given." The annals of the Government may be safely challenged for the production of another instance in which a valuable estate was deeded away upon the payment of one-third of the purchase money, without even requiring a mortgage for the balance due. The deferred payments are not even on interest, and though Maj. Eastman was sent out expressly to survey the tract into forty-acre lots, he appears not even to have completed the survey at all [he says in his testimony it was "nearly completed when he received instructions as Commissioner"] but in the contract of sale it is said to be "about seven thousand acres." Good judges testify that the area is from eight to ten thousand acres. Maj. Eastman testifies plumply that "the land is not secured to him [Steele] until it has been paid for, 'except by contract'—the exact contrary being stipulated in the contract, signed by Maj. Eastman.

7. That there should be all manner of loose testimony as to the value of a property so mysteriously sold, is almost a matter of course. Men were brought forward to swear it down to \$55,000, while equally good judges swore it up to \$400,000. Some swore the soil in the average poor—partly subject to overflow by the rivers; partly sandy and sterile; while others considered it in the average good grade. We infer that some of it is very good, but that, as a whole, it is not equal to the average of Minnesota. Some swore it a rare site for a city; others that it was worth little or nothing on that score. It is very generally agreed among the witnesses, however, that, if this site had been open to settlement fifteen years ago, the great commercial city of the Upper Mississippi would have been located here rather than at St. Paul; but the fact that St. Paul, St. Anthony, Minneapolis, &c., have so long a start, is hard to get over. Mr. Steele, however, testifies that he has begun to lay out a city on the Reserve, and has sold lots, even in these times, at fair town lot prices. Mr. H. B. Hancock, living in Minneapolis, and engaged in buying and leasing on lands, testifies that he considers this Reserve worth little or nothing now as a town-site, but worth fully \$200,000 for agricultural purposes. He Steele corroborates this by testifying that he has sold one-twenty-seventh of the Reserve for \$6,666 in cash or its equivalent, which is at the rate of \$179,982 for the whole. We presume \$200,000 about the fair, honest value of the property now, though it might easily have been sold for \$400,000 last Summer. The amount paid for it, including the real value of the improvements which Mr. Steele and others had some sort of equitable (but not legal) claim to compensation for, was about \$100,000, so that the gouge perpetrated on the Treasury is just about that amount.

8. A most significant feature of this business is the unwillingness of the parties concerned to tell from whom they first learned that Fort Snelling was to be sold. Dr. Graham, indeed, tells us that Secretary Floyd told him; but hear the others:

"Question 779. State whence you [Richard Schell] first derived the information that Fort Snelling was in market and for sale?"

"Answer. I do not distinctly recollect how I came in possession of the facts. I think I saw in a paper, during Pierce's administration, that the Fort was to be sold."

This statement is scarcely reconcilable with recorded facts. Rice tried, the year before, to induce the War Department to sell the Fort Snelling Reserve to Franklin Steele for fifteen dollars an acre, stating in his letter that the whole reservation, "including the overflowed lands," contained but five thousand acres, making the price, \$75,000. Secretary Jeff. Davis very promptly inserted the following flea in the ears of the confederate speculators:

"WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, May 6, 1856. "Sir: I duly received your letter of the 24th ult., including an offer of Mr. Franklin Steele to purchase the military reservation at Fort Snelling at fifteen dollars per acre."

"In reply, I have to say that the reservation is still needed for military purposes, and Mr. Steele's offer cannot, therefore, be entertained. His letter to you is herewith returned."

"Very respectfully,
JEFFERSON DAVIS,
Secretary of War."

"Hon. H. M. Rice, House of Representatives."

The authority to sell Fort Snelling was only wormed through Congress by Mr. Rice in the very last hours of Gen. Pierce's Administration, and then in terms that made no distinct allusion to that Fort. Nothing was ever said of it in the newspapers till the fact transpired that the Reserve had been privately sold. Yet Mr. Schell, when further pressed, persists that he "does not remember," "cannot say" &c., &c., from whom or how he first learned that Fort Snelling was to be sold. And Mr. John C. Mather, when pressed in a similar way, finally responds:

"I think I saw it in the *Times* sent me, among which was one authorizing the sale of these reservations."

Now, the Session Laws of Congress are very hard to get—as we have had ample reason to know, since we require an early copy every year to be condensed for our Almanac—for several weeks, after a session closes; this act (saying nothing of Fort Snelling) was not passed till March 3d; and Dr. Graham states that he went to Minnesota to sell this property for Mather, the Schells and himself (as he testifies) "the last of April, 1857." Of course, Mr. Mather—miscellaneous. But why is it deemed necessary by Mather, and the Schells to testify after this fashion? The "white heap yonder" is visible to all eyes; but who is the cat it seeks to conceal? If his name is not John B. Floyd, what is it?

9. Messrs. Eastman and Heiskell were appointed and paid as Commissioners to sell the Fort Snelling property—of course, to sell it justly for the Government, fairly for the community. It was perfectly notorious that there would be eager and wide competition for this property if it were known to be for sale. Though the Hon. Robert Smith's first letter of inquiry is ignored at the War office, yet the letters of John G. Sherburne and the Hon. Paul Dillingham (ex-M. C. from Vt.) asking to be allowed a chance to purchase, are there on file. Mr. D., writing from Waterbury, Vt., May 1, '57, tells Secretary Floyd "that he has learned that such lands and forts as are no longer needed are to be sold, and it has occurred to me that you will sell Fort Snelling, near where I would like to locate." Mr. D. tells Mr. Floyd that he "always has been, and am yet, a reliable Democrat—that he is tired of living in Vermont, where genuine Democracy is poorly thought of by the great colored party who rule, and always will, here." One would suppose such letters were worth a response through some idle clerk in the War Department, but never a word did they evoke. Messrs. Eastman and Heiskell went about the business of selling eight or ten thousand acres of highly valuable land as though it were the stealing of a sheep—saying nothing to nobody—never allowing it to transpire that they were commissioned for this purpose—never giving another person but Franklin Steele and his confederates a chance to make an offer—and selling the whole tract in a lump, within one week after Mr. Heiskell arrived, for half of its worth and a fourth of what it would have brought, and giving one and two years' credit without interest for two-thirds of the price!

10. Maj. Eastman favors the Committee and "the rest of mankind" with a definition that strikes us as a stunner. Hear him!

"Question 72. Your object was to get a good price."

"Answer. I presume so."

"Question 73. Why, then, did you not advertise it, in order to obtain the best price?"

"Answer. Because it would not then have been a private sale, [!!!], and our objects might have been defeated."

Maj. Eastman is of course entitled to a leather medal for his improvement in lexicography, but we cannot accept of it. We must insist that our respected patrons who advertise their farms, houses, &c., in THE TRIBUNE to be sold "at private sale" are not idiots. We don't dispute that this Fort Snelling was a private sale—very private—the most private, for such a property, that we ever heard of—but, though a more fair and open course might have spoiled the profit of the transaction, we insist that it would still, so long as the property was not put up at auction, have been a private sale to all credible intents and purposes.

11. We must close this too long expose; yet a single touch of Mr. William King Heiskell Secretary Floyd's townsman and special envoy, must not be omitted. Mr. H. testifies as follows:

"After the sale was made, Mr. Steele remarked that 'if we had sold the land to anybody else he would have claimed damages from the Government.' I remarked to him that I looked upon the sale about like this: 'If the sale had been made to anybody else, the Black Republicans in Congress would have been unscrupulous enough to have given you \$50,000 for your buildings. You are a Democrat, it is true; but for all that the Black Republicans would have given you \$50,000 for your buildings; so that I looked upon the sale as, in reality, made for \$30,000 or \$40,000 more than the price named.'"

—As neither Mr. Steele nor any one else had any possible pre-emption right to any part of this nor any other subsisting Reserve (the law being explicit on that point), we submit that Mr. Heiskell's eagerness to smuggle away the public property at half-price from apprehension that the wicked "Black Republicans" would give a Democrat \$50,000 of public money unjustly, was stretching his zeal for the interests of the Government entirely too far for a beggarly \$8 per day. Mr. Floyd should double the dose at once; and if Steele, Schell, and Co. do the fair thing by the Secretary, we insist that he shall give Heiskell an extra thousand out of his dividend. Such a watchful and wary virtue as this of Heiskell—a virtue that rushes in to swindle the Government out of \$100,000, for fear that the "Black Republicans" will steal and give to a Democrat only \$50,000—is too sublime to pass unrecorded in these evil days.

Happy Generally.

What a good time the so-called Democracy are having! They are so happy! and they seem to enjoy it so heartily, too. The present apparent complacent mood, and the shaking of hands and telling of experiences they are engaged in, and the general rejoicings everywhere makes us almost wish we were members of the party. The House congratulates the Senate, the Senate the House—Toombs, Clay, and others, compliment and congratulate the President, and that venerable slanderer and ingrate so intensely happy he is almost deprived of the power of speech. And what is for?

Why, they have succeeded in eluding the vigilance of the combined opposition, and palming off another humbug on the country, to come up in due time to distract and agitate it.

The Richmond "South" says: "In view of such important consequences, the people of the South will accept this settlement of the Kansas controversy with unfeigned satisfaction." And, exclaims the New York "News," "Kansas, thanks to the true Democracy, is out of the way at last, and something, we hope, may now be done toward legislating for general interests."

And who, we would ask, is to be thanked for "Kansas" ever being in the way? How came the question to be so confused and perplexing?

Thanks are due the Democracy for getting us into the difficulty, and still greater thanks are due that organization for making the difficulty more intricate. Thanks indeed!!!

A man may dig a pit and conceal its opening, direct us so unmistakably and particularly that we can't miss falling into it, and then for getting us out and putting us into a deeper and dirtier one, demands thanks, and exacts pay! That's about the position of the people and the so-called Democracy in reference to this pretended settlement of the Kansas question.

But the "South," after battling with heated zeal and almost unparalleled obstinacy, suddenly settles quietly down, and gives expression to the following groundless anticipations. That paper, speaking of the settlement and its probable results, says: "We may then anticipate a period of comparative quiet, during which the public mind will settle down on the non-intervention doctrine."

Now, that's rich to come from the intelligent editor of the "South." A time of comparative quiet may be anticipated during which the public mind will settle down on non-intervention!! If the public mind has not been settled down for years on that doctrine it was never settled down on any. If it was not disturbed by Walker in Kansas, under instructions from the President, we are much deceived; and if the English bill itself, over which there is so much sham glorification is not intervention in a most obvious form, we do not understand language. Non-intervention is the doctrine which has long been held by the people, but the party in power, and which got into power on that principle, has shamefully violated it, and hence all our troubles.

This Kansas difficulty was hatched, nursed and nourished by the so-called Democratic party. It has absorbed five months of the time Congress has been in session, and which has been spent in angry debate and inflammatory speeches. It has so retarded business that the New York "News," above quoted, is glad it is settled, because, now, something may be done for general interests—thus indirectly admitting that time has been wasted, and that the so-called Democracy, having a majority in both Houses, is responsible for it!

We congratulate the Country on the transient quiet this delusive settlement brings, for an interval of rest was needed. We sympathize with the Country in advance on account of the troubles impending, of which this bill is the germ. Or, should this fortunately prove a permanent settlement of this Kansas question, we almost know some other of equal or even of more perplexity will shortly be sprung.

As to the harmless display of ecstatic feeling, and boisterous and meaningless declamation indulged in by inflated demagogues, we have nothing to say and less to fear. We doubt not they are sincerely glad they have been temporarily extricated from the effects of a storm of their own raising, which well nigh destroyed them. We can excuse an exuberant flow of joy and rejoicing on the occasion of so narrow an escape. We cannot blame them for the exhibition, even though most of it may be sheer pretension, as we believe it to be.—Atlanta, Georgia.—National American.

DOINGS IN CONGRESS.

The proceedings of Congress during the past week have been of a general and miscellaneous nature, and relating chiefly to the business of the country. The appropriation bills and other matters have occupied its attention.

THE SENATE spent some days in the discussion of the bill to repeal the Fishing Bounty law, which finally passed by today.

One of the Minnesota Senators, Mr. Rice, was sworn in and took his seat. Gen. Shields, the other, not being here.

The House has referred the credentials of the three members elected from Minnesota—she is only allowed two—to the Committee on Elections.

They were chosen by general ticket, whereas the law requires members to be chosen by districts.

But the most interesting doings of the House were on Thursday in regard to—

THE DOORKEEPER OF THE HOUSE. Mr. KUNKEL, of Maryland, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted a report to the effect that R. B. Hackney, the Doorkeeper of the House, has employed a larger number of persons than he is allowed—some of them receiving no compensation, but depending on the grace and bounty of the House. There is (says the report) a great abuse of the confidence reposed in him, which cannot be too severely condemned. He has been admonished, again and again, but still persists in acting against usage and law, and in open defiance of the control of the committee. The report also shows great abuses in the folding-room—the Doorkeeper making false statements to the House as to the number of persons authorized to be employed, and that the economical objects of the committee have been frustrated. Instead of \$600, the expenses had been increased to \$2,000 or \$2,500 a month. False returns were made on the books, making the number of documents folded during the month of February, March, and April, one hundred and ninety-six thousand more than the statement of the Superintendent. The committee says there are other charges of malpractice and of a venal character against Mr. Hackney, but they do not think proper to report the declarations of his subordinates, over whom he dominates. He is unworthy of trust, (continues the report), and is either entirely incompetent to perform his duty, or shows a willful and deliberate purpose to pervert and abuse the power with which he is invested. The committee therefore report the following resolution:

Resolved, That R. B. Hackney, Doorkeeper of the present House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, dismissed forthwith from that office.

Mr. Kunkel moved that the report be printed and its further consideration postponed until Monday next at 1 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Nichols, of Ohio, Mr. Hackney was authorized to prepare and file his defence, and that it might be printed.

A PAID FIRE DEFENSE.

Mr. Morris, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported a bill to organize a paid fire department for the District of Columbia; and it was read twice and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Rev. Mason Noble will preach in the Sixth Presbyterian Church, corner of Maryland avenue and Sixth street, to-morrow (Sunday). Services to commence at eleven o'clock.

The afternoon of the Lord's Supper will be administered during the communion season may administer themselves with the church on profession of faith, on which account the Lecture on the Vision of the Apostle John in the Isle of Patmos, &c., will be postponed until the following Sabbath.

LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

TO OUR READERS.—We respectfully inform subscribers to the "American" that a new quarter has begun, the old expiring with No. 19, and request them to come forward and pay 65 cents for the ensuing quarter as early as possible. They may envelope the money and forward it to us by any safe hand. It is unnecessary to say to them that we need it.

PROTESTANT'S AWAKE!!!—THE BIBLE'S AT STAKE.—Men are nothing when the paramount consideration of the eternal salvation of ourselves and our offspring is involved. As for Mr. Berret, whatever may be his merits as an individual citizen, he is not worthy of a thought, in connection with the movement on foot to divide the school fund, and thus render it totally inefficient for the purposes for which it is intended. The Roman Catholics of this city as elsewhere have always been opposed to public schools, because the benefits they confer are conferred upon all alike, without distinction. It does not suit their peculiar notions that any other than what is known as the Douay Bible, shall be read, and therefore they are unwilling that the Bible, as recognized by all Protestant Christians, shall be read in the schools. Hence it is that they wish the school fund to be divided, and a specific portion of it given to the Roman Catholic church to be expended by Roman Catholic priests in the education of children in accordance with the tenets of the Roman Catholic church. For this purpose they have managed to secure the nomination of Mr. Berret, who is a Roman Catholic, for the Mayoralty, and a majority of Roman Catholics as the Democratic candidates for the Councils. A similar attempt has been made in Baltimore, New York, and elsewhere; but, God be thanked, without success, and it now remains for the Protestants of this city to defeat the plan which has been so cunningly devised. These people care nothing for men, provided they promote the cause of their church. Will Protestants look on and suffer such an iniquity to be practised without raising their hands to prevent it? Let Col. Berret be elected and a majority of Roman Catholic Councilmen, and what becomes of the Bible, as a text-book for the rising generation. The first thing we shall hear of, in such an event, will be the expulsion of the Protestant version of the Bible from the schools, and next the subdivision of the school fund so as to place a specific portion of it in the hands of Roman Catholic priests for the education of Roman Catholic children. All others, say they, are heretics, and as such not worthy to be instructed. Protestants! Awake, arise, or be forever fallen!!!

THE APPROACHING CITY ELECTIONS.—We would most respectfully warn the honest, fair-minded citizens of Washington, to be on their guard against the tricks and contrivances of the minions of the Executive. The true friends of order, peace, and conservative freedom, should keep a sharp look out for the movements of those who ousted, in their nomination, the present Mayor Magruder, nominated Mr. Berret, and who so lately attempted to put the city under the tyranny of a Pretorian Guard of more than two hundred men, at an annual cost to the Government of some two hundred thousand dollars annually—all these men to be appointed by and hold their offices at the will and pleasure of the President. Keep it constantly before the voters of Washington that Mr. Berret, and those who advocate his election, are of those who would take from us, as far as they can, all right to govern ourselves. They would have placed in position over us an army of tyrants—not of our own citizens, but such persons as the Executive may wish to provide for, who may come to Washington on their own business, and who desire to be supported until they can get into better business than ruling and kicking through the streets the humble citizens of Washington.

None more than we desire to see peace, good order, and good government maintained in our city. None would be more thankful than we for the city to receive pecuniary assistance from Congress to aid in maintaining a quiet and safe government; but if these tyrants really wanted to effect what they profess, why were they not willing to let the resident voters of the city elect a suitable citizen board, to make the appointments of the city police from among our own resident citizens?

By this free, republican method, we should have had a police most wisely and safely regulated. Those who had the appointments to make would have an interest in what they did, and be bound to appoint persons of like character, all directly or indirectly responsible to them. Never was a more unrelaxed attempt ever made to take from us the freedom of the city, under the pretence of giving us peace and protection. We would ask the attention of all our citizens, irrespective of party, to this most odious attempt to tyrannize over them, and by a united vote to rebuke it at the coming election.

THE MAYORALTY.—We copy the following extract from the Baltimore Patriot:

"The unfortunate resolutions of the Democratic Anti-Know-Nothing Convention has produced a state of feeling that augurs very unfavorable for the future harmony and peace of the city; and if there were no other objection to the Police Bill now before Congress, the action of the Convention in the passage of these resolutions secures its defeat beyond a peradventure. That a body of men, from some of whom, at least, we should have expected better things, should spread before the world a string of resolutions defamatory and slanderous in regard to a large number of the most respectable, order-loving, and law-abiding of our citizens, merely to gratify political rancor and to further their political designs, is without palliation or excuse. And if Colonel Berret, whatever may be his worth as a man, and however eminent his qualifications for the place, shall enter upon the canvass with these resolutions as his platform, we entertain the strongest confidence that he is doomed to be defeated. The citizens of Washington now owe it to themselves, and the future peace and prosperity of the city demand that they should unite and select, without distinction of party, a suitable candidate for Mayor."

God help the people of Washington, if through the prevalence of evil counsels, the mobocratic nominee for the Mayoralty could be elected. Cannot the people of Washington see the pitfall which is being dug for them? The attempt to pass a police bill, taking away from them and giving to the President the power of appointing a captain of the police, who, at the head of two hundred men, should exercise all the functions of police, acting out, as he would be compelled to do, the will of the President, regardless of the will and wishes of the people, should open their eyes to the desperate condition in which it is the desire and the intention of the anti-American party, backed by the power and influence of the Administration, to place them. But if this be not sufficient, surely the

interpretation to this bill, afforded by the resolutions passed by the anti-American convention, ought to arouse them to a sense of the deplorable condition in which the election of the nominee of that Convention will place them. Those resolutions are the platform of that party, and Colonel Berret, having accepted the nomination, stands upon that platform, and is pledged to carry out the will of the party, who in convention nominated him. What is the will of that party? Let the resolutions answer! Do you not feel and know that the will of the anti-American party is "power, plunder, and extended rule," and that they care not by what means they obtain that end—the end justifying the means? Look at "Bloody Monday"—remember the means used to obtain the election of a so-called Democratic Alderman in the Fourth Ward. Call to mind, too, the unprecedented means used, after the failure to elect, notwithstanding the wanton sacrifice of life, to oust the man, whom the people elected, from his seat, and to place therein the very man whom the people refused to vote for—by which means they succeeded in giving the seat to a Democrat and anti-American.

Call to mind, too, the combined effort of that party to throw the odium of these "deep and damning" deeds upon the American party of this city! Their presses labored and groaned under the weight of their false and lying statement. The people all over the country, were made to believe that the city of Washington was in the possession of the American party—that they had taken possession of the polls, and were murdering all who attempted to vote a ticket other than their own, and that, under these circumstances, the President, at the suggestion of the Mayor, ordered out the Marines, who, after firing upon them repeatedly, finally dispersed them, and restored order to the distracted city.

You know, and the whole country knows now, that the very reverse of this was the case, and we merely repeat these facts, in order that you may have them before your minds, while deciding who shall administer the city government after the first Monday in June next.

Can you, citizens of Washington, after all that you have seen and suffered—your relations and friends murdered before your eyes, in open day, under Democratic interpretation of law—after all the miserable, despicable, mean, contemptible persecutions which you have witnessed for opinion's sake—your streets filled up with murderers and assassins—your city given up to the tender mercies of those who have been reared in haunts of wickedness and crime, and who delight in scenes of conflagration, riot, and bloodshed—can you, we ask, vote for a man who stands pledged to carry out, if elected, the very principle—"rule or ruin"—which has made the city of Washington, for years past, a moral lagoon-house? Listen to the dictates of reason and common-sense. Learn wisdom from the past, and let the future declare that you have had enough of "rule or ruin," that you despise the principle which seeks to advance "party" at the expense of the country. Remember the watchword of your enemies at New Orleans—"booty and beauty"—and act, in the coming election, as did your fathers and brothers in that memorable contest, and you shall be free.

CIRCUIT COURT.—The inquisition ordered Tuesday in the case of Chapman vs. two of the Commissioners of Election, (Hines and Wright), in the First ward, in June last, gave damages for plaintiff in the sum of \$750. Mr. Wright died during the last month, so that the weight of the judgment will fall on Mr. Hines. The third commissioner, Mr. Denham, was a witness for the plaintiff. Mr. Charles Lee Jones conducted the case for the plaintiff.

We learn that the similar case in the Sixth ward is to be defended by the commissioners against whom the suit is brought. The opportunity to do this arises from the discovery of an error in the name of one of the parties in the bill. A third suit of the same kind has yet to be tried, viz: William Mullin vs. Thos. H. Barron and B. S. Kinsey, Commissioners of Election in the Seventh ward. In this suit Mr. Charles Lee Jones is retained for the plaintiff and Mr. Joseph H. Bradley for the defendants. Who don't want to sell his vote?

A man living in the Seventh Ward a few days since rented a house of a certain gentleman, and moved his family into it. He had been an occupant of the dwelling a very short time, when, during his absence, the wife of the landlord called on the wife of the tenant and inquired if her husband was a Roman Catholic. She replied, "that neither her husband nor herself were Catholics."

"Then you must move immediately, for I do not wish any other than Roman Catholics to occupy our houses," was the reply. When the husband came home, his wife related to him the conversation, saying she supposed they would have to move—and they did move. The names of these parties are in our possession, but we do not, at present at least, think it necessary to publish them. We give the facts.—They are suggestive, and we doubt not, will lead to reflection.

The great anti-American Locofoco demonstration came off on Tuesday night. It is unnecessary for us to give a description of it. Everybody knows it was a fizzle—more noise than sense—all sound, unadorned sound. The speakers demonstrated nothing. One said he was afraid of being robbed or murdered every moment, and the Colonel said that if he was elected, order should be restored in Washington. He didn't tell how—but simply said it should. He did not tell the people that he would, in person, head the police, and by his example aid them. Not he. He knows that he is afraid to go out after night. Don't let the matter trouble you Colonel, your services will not be required.

We find in the New York correspondence of the Baltimore Sun, the following paragraph: "A detachment of twenty marines left the marine barracks, Brooklyn, for Washington on Saturday."

The municipal election is soon to take place in Washington, and the marines above mentioned are intended, we suppose, as a reinforcement of those already in Washington, who preserved the purity of the last election there so effectually by bringing into a crowd of electors.—Are there not some marines at Norfolk that may also be spared to go to Washington for the occasion of the municipal election?—Lynchburg Virginian of the 7th inst.

SIXTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, (ISLAND).—We are informed that some sixteen or eighteen persons will unite themselves with this church, on profession of their faith, on Sabbath (to-morrow) afternoon.

The following are the resolutions of the Democratic and Anti-Know-Nothing (alias) Loco-Foco Convention, which nominated Mr. Berret.

"1. Resolved, That in presenting the name of James G. Berret for election as mayor of the city of Washington, we deem it proper to protest upon every consideration of truth and justice, against the impression which to some extent prevails in this community, as well as in Congress, that the present city government is responsible for the violence and outrage unfortunately prevailing here. [They are properly attributable to causes of an entirely different character. The defective moral training of the youth of the land, in consequence of the general disregard of parental obligations; the almost universal laxity of criminal jurisprudence, from a sickly sentimentality in regard to the punishment of capital crimes; the inadequate punishment inflicted for minor offences; the bad example of men in high places—these, and other causes combined, have vitiated the best elements of society everywhere, and inflicted upon it evils innumerable, if not incurable.]

"2. Resolved, That prominent among these causes was the introduction into our midst of the know-nothing organization, which by arraying friend against friend, and brother against brother, has broken up the pure fountains of friendship and love, precipitated upon us the bitter waters of fraternal strife and hatred, and shaken the very foundations of society.

"3. Resolved, That the evils incident to a partisan police are justly chargeable to that party. While in power it invaded, in a manner hitherto unprecedented, every department of the municipal government with the most ruthless proscription, striking down all who had not subscribed to its illegal tenets, and rendering life and property insecure by the notoriously partisan character of the entire police force of the city, who, urged on by influences engendered in secret political clubs, stimulated rather than repressed outrages of the most serious character. Whatever may be the failings of the present police force, those who compose it are not justly liable to the charge of being partisans. They are freemen, in the just sense of that term—unbound by unconstitutional oaths, and perfectly free to do justice to all, whether 'to the man born or not.' [Good! and applause.]

"